
From: Beverly [mailto:redstone25@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2006 5:24 PM
To: Meredith, Julie; KruegP@WADOT.WA.GOV
Subject: FW: Bridge replacement

From: Beverly [mailto:redstone25@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2006 5:22 PM
To: 'tim.ceis@seattle.gov'; 'David.Della@seattle.gov'; 'Sally.Clark@Seattle.gov';
'Richard.Conlin@seattle.gov'; 'Nick.Licata@seattle.gov'; 'Tom.Rasmussen@seattle.gov';
'Jan.Drago@Seattle.gov'; 'Jean.Godden@seattle.gov'; 'MiltonJ@WSDOT.WA.GOV';
'MeredJL@WSDOT.GOV'; 'KruegP@WADOT.WA.GOV'
Subject: Bridge replacement

I-1013-001

I urge you to REJECT the six-lane alternatives and instead build a four-lane plus dedicated transit-way for the future SR520. The construction phase of the six-lane alternative would cause huge negative impacts on my neighborhood and nearby waterways and wetlands. The Pacific Interchange Option is too massive in scale and completely inappropriate above native wetlands. The noise, air pollution, traffic, lighting and view interference associated with this Option are unacceptable. Marsh and Foster Islands and the Arboretum are some of our neighborhood's most precious resources and their destruction would be an egregious impact to all of Seattle. University of Washington and Children's Hospital would suffer significant negative impacts during construction and later as well.

I think we need a feasibility study for a potential tube tunnel instead of a 110' concrete high rise to connect to the I-5 interchange. I think there should be a requirement for mass transit and tolls on any 520 replacement.

Please don't allow Seattle to suffer destruction or degradation of its precious natural ecosystems or to experience such egregious traffic and other environmental impacts that this ill-advised proposal will surely cause.

Sincerely,

Beverly Cofrancesco
5157 NE Latimer Place
Seattle, WA 98105

I-1013-001

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.